

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE  
Transcriber's Office  
FLOOR DEBATE

March 28, 2006      LB 248, 904

SENATOR LANDIS: And that's the one we reported out. There will be at least two other amendments, one by Senator Baker and Senator Bourne and myself, and then I believe there's one by Senator Redfield, in which we can talk about the aftermath of this particular decision. I'd ask for the adoption of the committee amendments.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Mr. Clerk, amendment two?

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Baker had AM2645. Senator, I have a note you would like to withdraw AM2645 and offer as a substitute AM2935. (Legislative Journal pages 1272-1274.)

SENATOR CUDABACK: Any objection? So ordered.

CLERK: AM2935.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Landis, I understand you're going to handle this amendment?

SENATOR LANDIS: That's right.

SENATOR CUDABACK: You're recognized to do so.

SENATOR LANDIS: This is son of LB 248, a little blood knot that we had on the floor a little earlier, one that placed the Revenue Committee at odds with particularly Omaha. But a resolution has been achieved between those parties, although perhaps not the entire body. But let me tell you about it. LB 904 stands for the proposition that the historical road money tax base be, in fact, fully spent for roads. That tax base, of course, is the gas tax, but it's also the sales of motor vehicles. It's been the gas tax plus some portion of our sales tax revenue; that's the engine by which we build roads in this state. When we, under the coercive effect of the downturn of the economy three years ago, raised our sales tax rate to 5.5 percent, we did for the second time a deviation from that principle. For the second time, we took the increment of growth, that new half cent, and we sent it to a different purpose other than roads. Now the first time we did that was in